arXiv:0904.1906v1 [math.NT] 13 Apr 2009

On Diophantine approximations with positive integers: a remark to W.M.Schmidt's theorem

by **Nicky Moshchevitin**[1]

Abstract.

We prove a generalization of W.M. Schmidt's theorem related to the Diophantine approximations for a linear form of the type $\alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2 + y$ with *positive* integers x_1, x_2.

1 Introduction

Let $||\xi||$ denotes the distance from real ξ to the nearest integer. Let $\tau = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. In [1] W.M. Schmidt proved the following result.

Theorem 1. (W.M.Schmidt) *Let real numbers α_1, α_2 be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Z}$ together with 1. Then there exists a sequence of integer two-dimensional vectors $(x_1(i), x_2(i))$ such that*

1. $x_1(i), x_2(i) > 0$;
2. $||\alpha_1 x_1(i) + \alpha_2 x_2(i)|| \cdot (\max\{x_1(i), x_2(i)\})^\tau \to 0$ as $i \to +\infty$.

A famous conjecture that the exponent τ here may be replaced by $2-\varepsilon$ with arbitrary positive ε (see [1, 2]) is still unsolved. We would like to mention that there are various generalizations of W.M. Schmidt's theorem by P.Thurnheer [3, 4] Y. Bugeaud and S. Kristensen [5] and some other mathematicians.

For a real $\gamma \geqslant 2$ we define a function

$$g(\gamma) = \tau + \frac{2\tau - 2}{\tau^2\gamma - 2}.$$

One can see that $g(\gamma)$ is a strictly decresaing function and

$$g(2) = 2, \quad \lim_{\gamma \to +\infty} g(\gamma) = \tau.$$

For positive Γ define

$$C(\Gamma) = 2^{18}\Gamma^{\frac{\tau-\tau^2}{\tau^2\gamma-2}}.$$

In this paper we prove the following statement.

---

[1] Research is supported by the grant RFBR No. 09-01-00371-a

Theorem 2. *Suppose that real numbers α_1, α_2 satisfy the following Diophantine condition. For some $\Gamma \in (0,1)$ and $\gamma \geqslant 2$ the inequality*

$$||\alpha_1 m_1 + \alpha_2 m_2|| \geqslant \frac{\Gamma}{(\max\{|m_1|, |m_2|\})^{\gamma}} \tag{1}$$

holds for all integer vectors $(m_1, m_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$. Then there exists an infinite sequence of integer two-dimensional vectors $(x_1(i), x_2(i))$ such that

1. $x_1(i), x_2(i) > 0$;
2. $||\alpha_1 x_1(i) + \alpha_2 x_2(i)|| \cdot (\max\{x_1(i), x_2(i)\})^{g(\gamma)} \leqslant C(\Gamma)$ for all i.

Of course the constant 2^{18} in the definition of $C(\Gamma)$ may be reduced.

2 The best approximations

Suppose that $1, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Z}$. For an integer point $\mathbf{m} = (m_0, m_1, m_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ we define

$$\zeta(\mathbf{m}) = m_0 + m_1\alpha_1 + m_2\alpha_2.$$

A point $\mathbf{m} = (m_0, m_1, m_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \setminus \{(0,0,0)\}$ is defined to be *a best approximation (in the sense of linear form)* if

$$\zeta(\mathbf{m}) = \min_{\mathbf{n}} \|\zeta(\mathbf{n})\|,$$

where the minimum is taken over all the integer vectors $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, n_1, n_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ such that

$$0 < \max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2} |n_j| \leqslant \max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2} |m_j|.$$

All the best approximations form a sequence of points $\mathbf{m}_\nu = (m_{0,\nu}, m_{1,\nu}, m_{2,\nu})$ with increasing $\max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2} |m_{j,\nu}|$.

Let us denote

$$\zeta_\nu = \zeta(\mathbf{m}_\nu), \quad M_\nu = \max_{1 \leqslant j \leqslant 2} |m_{j,\nu}|.$$

Then

$$\zeta_1 > \zeta_2 > \cdots > \zeta_\nu > \zeta_{\nu+1} > \cdots$$

and

$$M_1 < M_2 < \cdots < M_\nu < M_{\nu+1} < \cdots .$$

It follows from the Minkowski convex body theorem that

$$\zeta_\nu M_{\nu+1}^2 \leqslant 1. \tag{2}$$

To prove the inequality (2) one should consider the parallelepiped $\Omega_\nu \in \mathbb{R}^3$ which consisit of all points $(y, x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ satisfying the inequalities

$$\begin{cases} |y + \alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2| < \zeta_\nu, \\ \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|\} < M_{\nu+1} \end{cases} .$$

Then there is no non-zero integer points in Ω_ν and (2) follows.

3 A statement about consecutive best approximations

Now we formulate a rather technical result.

Theorem 3. *Let*

$$\begin{vmatrix} m_{0,\nu-1} & m_{1,\nu-1} & m_{2,\nu-1} \\ m_{0,\nu} & m_{1,\nu} & m_{2,\nu} \\ m_{0,\nu+1} & m_{1,\nu+1} & m_{2,\nu+1} \end{vmatrix} \neq 0. \tag{3}$$

Then at least one of two satements below is valid.

(i) *There exists an integer point* (x_1^0, x_2^0) *such that*
1. $x_1^0, x_2^0 > 0$;
2. $M_{\nu+2} \leqslant \max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \leqslant 4M_{\nu+2}$;
3. $||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| \leqslant 16(\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\})^{-2}$.

(ii) *There exists an integer point* (x_1^0, x_2^0) *such that*
1. $x_1^0, x_2^0 > 0$;
2. $\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \leqslant 240 M_{\nu+1}^{\tau} M_{\nu}^{-\frac{1}{\tau}}$;
3. $||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| \leqslant 24^{\tau} M_{\nu}^{\frac{1-\tau}{\tau}} (\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\})^{-\tau}$.

It is a well-known fact (see for example [6, 7]) that there exists infinitely many ν such that (3) holds, provided that the numbers $1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Z}$. So Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 3 as $M_\nu \to +\infty$, $\nu \to +\infty$.

Here we would like to give few comments. Theorem 3 may be treated as a "local" statement which provides the existence of a small value of the linear form $||\alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2||$ relatively "close" to the best approximations satisfying (3). We shall give the proof of Theorem 3 in next two sections. The proof follows the original construction due to W.M.Schmidt [1], however it includes few modifications.

Now we show that Theorem 3 implies Theorem 2.

Suppose that the statement **(i)** holds for infinitely many ν. Then as $C(\Gamma) \geqslant 16$, $g(\gamma) \leqslant 2$ we see that Theorem 2 follows from Theorem 3 obviously.

So we may assume that the statement **(ii)** holds for infinitely many ν. From the condition (1) of Theorem 2 and from the inequality (2) applied to the vector $(m_1, m_2) = (m_{1,\nu}, m_{2,\nu})$ we deduce that

$$\Gamma M_\nu^{-\gamma} \leqslant M_{\nu+1}^{-2}.$$

The last inequality together with the statement 2 of **(ii)** gives

$$240^{-\frac{2\tau}{\tau^2\gamma-2}} \times \Gamma^{\frac{\tau^2}{\tau^2\gamma-2}} \times \left(\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\}\right)^{\frac{2\tau}{\tau^2\gamma-2}} \leqslant M_\nu.$$

Now we substitute the last inequality into the statement 3 of **(ii)** and obtain

$$||\alpha_1 x_1(i) + \alpha_2 x_2(i)|| \leqslant \frac{C(\Gamma)}{(\max\{x_1(i), x_2(i)\})^{g(\gamma)}}.$$

Theorem 2 is proved.

4 Lemmata

Put

$$R_\nu = 2(M_{\nu+1}\zeta_\nu)^{-1}.$$

From (2) it follows that $R_\nu > M_{\nu+1}$.

Lemma 1. *Let numbers $1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$, be linearly independent over $\mathbb{Z}$. Then there exists an integer point $\mathbf{x}^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0)$ such that*

1. $x_1^0, x_2^0 > 0$;
2. $\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \leqslant R_\nu$;
3. $||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| < \zeta_\nu$.

Proof.

Consider the papallelepiped Ω_ν^1 defined by the system of inequalities

$$\begin{cases} |\alpha_1 x_1 + \alpha_2 x_2 + y| \leqslant \zeta_\nu, \\ |x_1 - x_2| \leqslant M_{\nu+1}, \\ |x_1 + x_2| \leqslant R_\nu. \end{cases}$$

As $M_{\nu+1} R_\mu \zeta_\nu = 2$, the measure of Ω_ν^1 is equal to 8. Hence by the Minkowski convex body theorem there exists a non-zero integer point $\mathbf{z}^0 = (y^0, x_1^0, x_2^0) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 \cap \Omega_\nu^1$. As it was mentioned in Section 2 parallelepiped Ω_ν contains no non-zero integer points. So $\mathbf{z} \in \Omega_2 \setminus \Omega_1$. We see that for the integers x_1^0, x_2^0 the statements 1 -3 of Lemma 1 are true (the strict inequalities in 1 and 3 follow from the linear independence of $1, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$).

Lemma is proved.

Remark. As the inequality in the statement 3 of Lemma 1 is a strict one we deduce that $\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \geqslant M_{\nu+1}$.

Corollary 1. *Let the following inequality be valid:*

$$\zeta_\nu \geqslant (8M_{\nu+1}^2)^{-1}. \tag{4}$$

Then there exists an integer point $\mathbf{x}^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0)$ such that

1. $x_1^0, x_2^0 > 0$;
2. $M_{\nu+1} \leqslant \max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \leqslant 4M_{\nu+1}$;
3. $||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| \leqslant 16(\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\})^{-2}$.

Proof.

Apply Lemma 1. The numbers x_j^0 from Lemma 1 are positive. Inequality (4) and the remark after Lemma 1 lead to the statement 2 of Corollary 1. Now we apply the statement 3 of Lemma 1, the inequality (2) and the statement 2 of Corollary 1 to see that

$$||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| \leqslant \zeta_\nu \leqslant M_{\nu+1}^{-2} \leqslant 16(\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\})^{-2}.$$

Corollary 1 is proved.

Put

$$A_\nu = \frac{M_\nu^{1/\tau}}{120}.$$

Corollary 2. *Suppose that*

$$\zeta_\nu \geqslant A_\nu M_{\nu+1}^{-\frac{\tau}{\tau-1}}. \qquad (5)$$

Then there exists an integer point $\mathbf{x}^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0)$ *such that*

1. $x_1^0, x_2^0 > 0$;
2. $M_{\nu+1} \leqslant \max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \leqslant 2M_{\nu+1}^\tau A_\nu^{-1}$;
3. $||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| \leqslant 24^\tau M_\nu^{\frac{1-\tau}{\tau}} (\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\})^{-\tau}$.

Proof.

Apply Lemma 1. The numbers x_j^0 from Lemma 1 are positive. The inequality (5) leads to the bound

$$R_\nu \leqslant 2A_\nu^{-1} M_{\nu+1}^{\frac{1}{\tau-1}} = 2A_\nu^{-1} M_{\nu+1}^\tau$$

(as $\tau^2 = \tau + 1$). This argument in view of the statement 2 from Lemma 1 together with the Remark to Lemma 1 lead to the statement 2 of Corollary 2. Moreover, from (5) we see that

$$||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| \cdot (\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\})^\tau \leqslant \zeta_\nu R_\nu^\tau = 2^\tau \zeta_\nu^{1-\tau} M_{\nu+1}^{-\tau} \leqslant 2^\tau A_\nu^{1-\tau} \leqslant 24^\tau M_\nu^{\frac{1-\tau}{\tau}}.$$

Corollary 2 is proved.

Lemma 2. *Consider consecutive best approximation vectors* $\mathbf{m}_j$, $j = \nu - 1, \nu, \nu + 1$ *such that the inequality (3) holds. Suppose that the following two inequalities are valid:*

$$\zeta_\nu \leqslant (8M_{\nu-1}M_{\nu+1})^{-1}, \quad \zeta_{\nu+1} \leqslant (8M_{\nu-1}M_\nu)^{-1}. \qquad (6)$$

Then there exists an integer point (x_1^0, x_2^0) *such that*

1. $x_1^0, x_2^0 > 0$;
2. $\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \leqslant 20M_{\nu+1}$;
3. $||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| < 40M_{\nu+1}M_\nu^{-1}\zeta_\nu$.

Proof.

As

$$1 \neq \begin{vmatrix} m_{0,\nu-1} & m_{1,\nu-1} & m_{2,\nu-1} \\ m_{0,\nu} & m_{1,\nu} & m_{2,\nu} \\ m_{0,\nu+1} & m_{1,\nu+1} & m_{2,\nu+1} \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} \zeta_{\nu-1} & m_{1,\nu-1} & m_{2,\nu-1} \\ \zeta_\nu & m_{1,\nu} & m_{2,\nu} \\ \zeta_{\nu+1} & m_{1,\nu+1} & m_{2,\nu+1} \end{vmatrix},$$

we see that

$$1 \leqslant |x_{1,\nu}x_{2,\nu+1} - x_{2,\nu}x_{1,\nu+1}|\zeta_{\nu-1} + 2M_{\nu-1}M_{\nu+1}\zeta_\nu + 2M_{\mu-1}M_\nu\zeta_{\nu+1}.$$

We apply (6) to see that

$$D_\nu := |x_{1,\nu}x_{2,\nu+1} - x_{2,\nu}x_{1,\nu+1}| \geqslant (2\zeta_{\nu-1})^{-1}.$$

From (2) with ν replaced by $\nu - 1$ we have

$$D_\nu \geqslant M_\nu^2/2. \qquad (7)$$

Consider two-dimensional integer vectors

$$\xi_\nu = (x_{1,\nu}, x_{2,\nu}), \quad \xi_{\nu+1} = (x_{1,\nu+1}, x_{2\nu+1}),$$

and the lattice

$$\Lambda_\nu = \langle \xi_\nu, \xi_{\nu+1} \rangle_{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

The fundamental two-dimensional volume of the lattice Λ_ν is equal to D_ν.

Define $\xi_\nu^\perp$ to be the vector of the unit length orthogonal to the vector ξ_ν. Consider the rectangle Ω_ν^2 which consists of all points of the form

$$\mathbf{x} = \theta_1 \xi_\nu + \theta_2 \xi_\nu^\perp, \quad |\theta_1| \leqslant 1, \ |\theta_2| \leqslant D_\nu M_\nu^{-1}.$$

Then the measure of Ω_ν^2 is $\geqslant 4D_\nu$. As Ω_ν^2 is a convex 0-symmetric body we may apply the Minkowski convex body theorem. This theorem ensures that in Ω_ν^2 there exists a point of Λ, independent on ξ_ν. Hence the rectangle Ω_ν^2 (as well as any of its translations) covers a certain fundamental domain with respect to the lattice Λ. Note that the inequality (7) leads to the inequality $2D_\nu M_\nu^{-1} \geqslant M_\nu$. So we see that any circle of the radius $4D_\nu M_\nu^{-1}$ covers a certain fundamental domain with respect to the lattice Λ. Particulary any circle of the radius $4D_\nu M_\nu^{-1}$ covers at least one point of the lattice Λ. We take a circle $\mathcal{C}$ of the radius $4D_\nu M_\nu^{-1}$ centered at the point $(5D_\nu M_\nu^{-1}, 5D_\nu M_\nu^{-1})$. Then the point $\mathbf{x}^0 = (x_1^0, x_2^0) \in \mathcal{C} \cap \Lambda$ has positive coordinates $x_1^0, x_2^0 > 0$. Moreover

$$\mathbf{x}^0 = \lambda_\nu \xi_\nu + \lambda_{\nu+1} \xi_{\nu+1},$$

with integer $\lambda_\nu, \lambda_{\nu+1}$.

As

$$|x_1^0| = |x_{1,\nu}\lambda_1 + x_{1,\nu+1}\lambda_{\nu+1}| \leqslant 10D_\nu M_\nu^{-1}, \ \ |x_2^0| = |x_{2,\nu}\lambda_1 + x_{2,\nu+1}\lambda_{\nu+1}| \leqslant 10D_\nu M_\nu^{-1}, \tag{8}$$

and $M_j = \max\{|x_{1,j}|, |x_{2,j}|\}$, we see that

$$|\lambda_\nu| \leqslant 20 M_{\nu+1} M_\mu^{-1}, \ \ |\lambda_{\nu+1}| \leqslant 20.$$

So

$$||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| \leqslant |\lambda_\nu|\zeta_\nu + |\lambda_{\nu+1}|\zeta_{\nu+1} \leqslant 20 M_{\nu+1} M_\nu^{-1} \zeta_\nu + 20\zeta_{\nu+1} \leqslant 40 M_{\nu+1} M_\nu^{-1} \zeta_\nu.$$

The statement 3 of Lemma 2 is proved.

As $D_\nu \leqslant 2M_\nu M_{\nu+1}$ we deduce from (8) that

$$\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \leqslant 20 M_{\nu+1}.$$

So the statement 2 of Lemma 2 is verified and Lemma 2 is proved.

Remark. The contitions (6) are technical. Unfortunately we cannot avoid them as the inequalites (2) with $j = \nu, \nu+1$ are not sufficient for the proof.

Corollary 3. *Let the inequality (3) be valid for ν large enough. Suppose that*

$$\zeta_\nu < A_\nu M_{\nu+1}^{-\frac{\tau}{\tau-1}}. \tag{9}$$

In addition suppose that the second inequality from (6) is also satisfied. Then there exists an integer point (x_1^0, x_2^0) such that

1. $x_1^0, x_2^0 > 0$;
2. $\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\} \leqslant 20 M_{\nu+1}$;
3. $||\alpha_1 x_1^0 + \alpha_2 x_2^0|| < 24^\tau M_\nu^{\frac{1-\tau}{\tau}} (\max\{x_1^0, x_2^0\})^{-\tau}$.

Proof.

For ν large enough the first inequality from (6) follows from (9). Now Corollary 3 immediately follows from Lemma 2.

5 Proof of Theorem 3

Suppose that $\zeta_{\nu+1} \geqslant (8M_{\nu+2}^2)^{-1}$. Then we apply Corollary 1 (with ν replaced by $\nu+1$). The statement **(i)** of Theorem 3 follows.

Suppose that $\zeta_{\nu+1} < (8M_{\nu+2}^2)^{-1}$. As $M_{\nu+2} \geqslant M_\nu \geqslant M_{\nu-1}$ and $\zeta_{\nu+1} \leqslant M_{\nu+2}^{-2}$ we see that the second inequality from (6) is satisfied. In the case $\zeta_\nu \geqslant A_\nu M_{\nu+1}^{\frac{\tau}{\tau-1}}$ we apply Corollary 2. In the case $\zeta_\nu \leqslant A_\nu M_{\nu+1}^{\frac{\tau}{\tau-1}}$ we apply Corollary 3. So we establish statements 1, 3 from **(ii)**. The statement 2 from **(ii)** also follows from the Corollaries 2,3 as $M_{\nu+1}^{\tau-1} = M_{\nu+1}^{1/\tau} \geqslant M_\nu^{1/\tau}$.

Theoreem 3 is proved.

References

[1] W.M. Schmidt, *Two questions in Diophantine approximations*, Monatshefte für Mathematik **82**, 237 - 245 (1976).

[2] W. M. Schmidt, *Open problems in Diophantine approximations*, in "Approximations Diophantiennes et nombres transcendants' Luminy, 1982, Progress in Mathematics, Birkhäuser, p.271 - 289 (1983).

[3] P. Thurnheer, *Zur diophantischen Approximation von zwei reellen Zahlen*, Acta Arithmetica **44**, 201-206 (1984).

[4] P. Thurnheer, *On Dirichlet's theorem concerning Diophantine approximation*, Acta Arithmetica **54**, 241-250 (1990).

[5] Y. Bugeaud, S. Kristensen, *Dipohantine exponents for mildly restricted approximation*, Preprint avaliable at: arXiv

[6] H. Davenport, W.M. Schmidt, *Approximation to real numbers by quadratic irrationals*, Acta Arithmetica **13**, 169 - 176 (1967).

[7] N.G.Moshchevitin, *Best Diophantine approximations: the phenomenon of degenerate dimension.* London Mathematical Society, Lecture Note Series **338**, 158–182 (2007).

author:
Nikolay G. Moshchevitin
Moscow Lomonosov State University
Vorobiovy Gory, GSP–1
119991 Moscow, RUSSIA
E-mail: `moshchevitin@mech.math.msu.su, moshchevitin@rambler.ru`